DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 975 UD 019 739

TITLE Quality Education for All: Report of the Education Task Force of the Urban Coalition of Minneapolis.
INSTITUTION Urban Coalition of Minneapolis, Minn.
PUB DATE 29 May 79
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement: American Indians: Blacks: *Educational Accountability: Educational Improvement: *Educational Quality: Elementary Secondary Education: Evaluation Criteria: *Minority Group Children: Nondiscriminatory Education: Parent Participation: *Public Schools: *School Administration: Spanish Speaking: Teacher Evaluation: Teacher Integration
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The quality of education for nonwhite students in the Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) is examined in this report. Three areas are discussed: (1) student achievement: (2) evaluation of teachers, principals, and administrators: and (3) system accountability. Emphasis is placed on the accountability of the MPS to the black, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino communities. Basic problems within the MPS which have a particularly serious effect on nonwhite students are identified and briefly summarized. Recommendations are made for rectifying problems in each of the three areas. A special argument is presented for the need to improve the quantity and quality of parental involvement in the educational process. An evaluation form for tenured teachers, listings of resource persons and task force participants, and a bibliography are appended. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AUG 5 1979 AUG 6 1979

QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL

ED175975

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION TASK FORCE

OF THE

URBAN COALITION OF MINNEAPOLIS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M R Cohen
Urban Coalition of Minneapolis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

UD019739

URBAN COALITION OF MINNEAPOLIS

MAY 29, 1979

URBAN COALITION OF MINNEAPOLIS

May 29, 1979

To the Members of the
Minneapolis Board of Education,
Minneapolis Public School
Personnel, and the Community:

Quality Education for All, the report of the Education Task Force of the Urban Coalition of Minneapolis, is the product of nine months of effort by the sixteen members of the Education Task Force.

It is the Task Force's hope that this report will stimulate community discussion of critical educational issues and serve as a catalyst for action by the Board of Education. The Task Force respectfully requests that the Board of Education respond to the community in a prompt and definite manner regarding each of the issues discussed in this report.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Beech
Chairperson
Education Task Force

Suite 303 • 1009 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403 • Telephone (612) 348-8550

Education Task Force Members

Gayle Adelsman

Ramon Almeida

Jeb Beaulieu

Tom Beech, Chairperson

Kambon Camara

Ralph Crowder

Jan Donnelly

Mary Hewitt

Judy Justad

Ron McKinley

David Nasby

Eileen Nevilles

Al Park

Eulalia Reyes de Smith

Patricia Scott

Sharon Slettehaugh

Marcea Staten

Ruth Werntz

Part I: INTRODUCTION

On August 24, 1978, the Board of Directors of the Urban Coalition of Minneapolis created a Task Force to examine the quality of education for Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students in the Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS). The creation of this Task Force was a response to the doubt, frustration and anger felt for years by non-white residents of Minneapolis about the failures of the Minneapolis school system in providing educational services to non-white children.

The members of the Task Force are for the most part parents of students within the MPS, Blacks, Indians, Chicano/Latinos and Whites; lay people who, though they are not professional educators, care deeply about the education of the children of this city.

The Task Force met bi-weekly from September through December and weekly from January through May. It struggled with many aspects of elementary and secondary education: from reading, writing and arithmetic to the unresponsiveness of school personnel; from high dropout rates to bilingual/bicultural education; from parental involvement and community control to discipline in the classroom. But the discussions of the Task Force and, consequently, this report came to focus on three areas of special importance: 1) student achievement, 2) evaluation of teachers, principals and administrators, and 3) system accountability.

One idea is central to all three areas and this entire report: ACCOUNTABILITY. The primary concern of the members of this Task Force is accountability to the Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino communities. But

the Task Force firmly believes that accountability to these communities would inevitably produce greater accountability to all communities.

The primary emphasis of the Task Force has been the impact of the MPS on students. Task Force members have been struck in their work by the prevalence of educational literature that confounds and confuses the issue of educational effectiveness by asserting, for example: that schools cannot be held accountable because there are "too many variables affecting educational achievement;" that teachers and administrators cannot be evaluated because education is "too subjective;" and that the relatively lower levels of achievement of non-white students are based on "socioeconomic factors" and a "lack of educational tradition among parents." The Coleman Report[1] is the most influential research document espousing this position, which could be characterized as a theory of "socioeconomic determinism" of educational achievement.

The Task Force found ample evidence that the MPS has adopted this theory of education, a theory that conveniently places responsibility for the lack of educational achievement of non-white students outside the school system.

By adopting this line of argument the MPS can effectively deny responsibility for the education of Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students. Even worse, a self-fulfilling prophecy results. What exists is a situation in which the institution (MPS) mandated to provide a public service (education) identifies outside factors as the reasons for its failure to provide that service. Since the institution can control none of these factors (they are a "broader societal problem"), it cannot be held accountable for providing the mandated service when these factors are present.

Educational research on the causes of educational achievement is misleading. Causation is the real issue. The Coleman Report and other similar studies find a correlation between certain socioeconomic factors and student achievement, i.e., when students have certain racial or economic characteristics

a predictable pattern of student achievement occurs. This correlation does not prove, however, as alleged in this research, that the socioeconomic factors actually cause the pattern of student achievement.

In light of this it is important to note that the Task Force found examples in the literature of schools in various parts of the United States that do an effective job of providing educational services to low income and non-white students.[2]

The educational literature also offers research demonstrating: that lower teacher expectations vis a' vis non-white students can cause lower achievement by those students; that predominantly white faculty generally do not relate as well to non-white students, resulting in lower achievement levels; and that racism often prevents effective teaching of non-white students. Thus there is a body of research that places the onus of low achievement by non-white students on schools and school personnel, not non-white students or their parents.

The fundamental premise of the Task Force is derived from a systhesis of these findings. This premise, which guided the work of the Task Force, is that as a matter of public policy, the Minneapolis Public Schools must bear the primary responsibility for the education of ALL students in the school system.

It is on this basis that the Task Force--specifically concerned about the education of non-white students--presents its report to the Minneapolis Public Schools and the Minneapolis community.

Part II: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Each year the MPS publishes Profiles in Performance, a report listing the scores of MPS students on a variety of examinations and other factors affecting student achievement. Profiles in Performance has become the barometer of school performance in Minneapolis. It has been cited by state officials as an exemplary model of student achievement reporting.

The most recent report, based on the 1977-78 school year, was touted by MPS personnel and other commentators as proof of the quality of the MPS.[3] More significantly, these results were indicated by Profiles to have been achieved despite changes in the composition of the student population that were expected to result in lower scores. As the report stated, "This increase or stability in achievement scores occurred during a period when such stability or increase would seem unwarranted since indices of low socioeconomic status in Minneapolis have increased gradually from 1967 to 1978."[4] The Minneapolis Star echoed this interpretation in the lead of its January 31, 1979, article: "Minneapolis public school students held their own or improved a bit on standardized reading and math tests last year, even though the socioeconomic level of the city's students continued to decline. . ."[5]

Both of these statements represent a clear, straight-forward invocation of socioeconomic determinism. Graphs depicting the percentage of students from AFDC families in the school system are used to document the decline in socioeconomic indices.[6] The gains or stability in achievement levels are attributed to such things as "increased teacher effort," "parental support" and assistance that elementary school students have received through various MPS programs.[7]

Moreover, Profiles uses socioeconomic data in a highly selective manner to bolster the image of the MPS. It invokes a "we're-better-than-Cleveland" argument in its comparison of the achievement of MPS and other "large city" students on standardized mathematics tests. Science Research Associates has developed large city (42 cities with population of 300,000 or more) test norms in mathematics. Profiles documents that "Minneapolis students...are above large city norms in both mathematics concepts and mathematic computation."[8] It fails, however, to compare at the same time the socioeconomic conditions in Minneapolis and the large cities in which data were collected. Following Profiles, own logic, the better scores in Minneapolis could well be attributed to higher socioeconomic indices here than in the other 41 cities.

Further evidence of the MPS's self-serving reliance on the overriding influence of socioeconomic factors appears in the cautionary notes regarding interpretation of test results, which attempt to remove responsibility for student performance from the MPS. A sample of the notes taken directly from Profiles is shown below:

> 6. There are many background or "input" factors which have been shown to affect school learning but which the schools cannot control. These factors include family socioeconomic level and the educational level of the parents. Other "input" factors such as availability of books in the home educational advancement, nutrition, etc., also are significant. The possible influence of these environmental factors should be kept in mind when interpreting test profiles. . .
>
> 8. It is very important that the reader be cautious of making any comparative value judgments about the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the instructional program in a given school because of the test profiles portrayed in the charts that follow. Considering all the "input" factors in a given community, the faculty in a school whose test profile shows a comparatively low median score may be one of the most competent and hard-working faculties in the school system and may be accomplishing more for its pupils than faculty at another school where the majority of students are achieving above the median.[9]

Despite the selective invocation of socioeconomic forces to rationalize differences in student achievement, the MPS does not provide a systematic summary and analysis of achievement data by relevant socioeconomic groupings. In particular, it does not present race-based data. The most relevant data presented in Profiles were the percentage of students from AFDC families and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. These data were, however, presented in isolation. No attempt was made to integrate them more closely with student achievement data at either the student or school level.

It might be argued that achievement data disaggregated by relevant socioeconomic factors merely confirms the Coleman thesis. The Task Force's alternative interpretation is that the MPS is not effectively educating poor and non-white students. The important point is that the MPS does not even present these data. The school system rather presents aggregate data and invokes the theory of socioeconomic determinism, using it as a rationalization for its own systemic failures.

Summary of MPS's Failures

The following subsections identify and briefly summarize a series of problems within the MPS, which have a particularly serious effect upon non-white students. Taken as a group, these problems represent what amounts to a prima facie case for the failure of the MPS to provide a quality education for Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students.

To permit the MPS to deny responsibility for these problems is effectively to allow the school system to abrogate its responsibility to a significant and rapidly growing segment of the school population. The Task Force asserts that these failures cannot be permitted to persist behind the rationale of socioeconomic determinism.

Dropouts

Dropout statistics are probably the most dramatic indicator of the failure of the schools to educate minority students. A longitudinal study by the MPS, Progress Report on Minneapolis School Dropout Study,[10] tracked 4,752 tenth grade students beginning in 1974. It found that by August, 1977, 19% (900 students) had dropped out. A disproportionate number of the dropouts were non-white students. At the end of that period, 51% of the Indian students and 29% of the Black students had dropped out. As in many other instances, no data were kept on Chicano/Latino students.

An equally disturbing set of statistics regarding rates of graduation was also reported in this study. Only 12.0% of all Indian students who began tenth grade in the fall of 1974 graduated by August, 1977; 41.4% of all Black students and 64.7% of "all others" starting tenth grade at that time graduated by August, 1977. The average graduation rate for all students participating in this longitudinal study was 60.3%.

Table I: Dropout Study Data

		1977 Dropouts		1977 Graduates	
	1974 No. of Students	No. of Students	Percentage	No. of Students	Overall Percentage
All Students	4,752	900	18.9%	2,869	60.3%
Blacks	527	152	28.8%	218	41.4%
Indians	158	80	50.6%	19	12.0%
All Other Students	4,067	668	16.4%	2,632	64.7%

When examined more closely, these data must be viewed as merely scratching the surface of the problem.[11] Among the sources of bias and underestimation of the problem contained in the school system's data are:

1) The operative definition of "dropout" used by the MPS pertains only to students leaving school from the tenth grade or higher. Thus it ignores dropouts from late elementary and junior high schools. According to members of the Task Force from the relevant communities, the period of greatest attrition for Indian and Chicano/Latino students is prior to tenth grade. The Indian Upward Bound program was transferred from high school to junior high school to reflect this pattern.
2) A number of the non-white students counted as "graduates" in the study attended and graduated from alternative schools.* Thus, the number of non-white students graduating from taditional units of the MPS was overestimated in this report.

Task Force members are also aware that a significant percentage of the students considered "enrolled" are in fact "operational" dropouts. Their names appear on the school rolls, but they are effectively non-participants in the school program.

The MPS is currently using a $671,863 federal grant funded under the Emergency School Aid Act for a nine-month dropout program. The program is designed to acquaint teachers and other school personnel with the special problems of dropouts and potential dropouts. Program staff develop workshops and other programs to sensitize teachers and other staff to this problem.

---

*The Federation of Alternative Schools includes The Center, The City, Loring-Nicollet, Bethlehem Center and the Urban League Street Academy.

The program is not yet completed and no performance data is currently available. Thus, the Task Force could not conduct a detailed evaluation. There are, however, serious questions concerning the project. For example, the necessary assumption underlying an in-service training approach, such as this, is that the causes of dropping out and necessary preventive steps are well understood. In light of the absence of any regular follow-up of dropouts to determine their reasons for leaving and potential needs, the Task Force doubts that there is justification for this approach instead of one dealing more directly with students and former students. The Task Force questions whether this program is the most effective use of resources to deal with the dropout problem. This question is particularly important because of the MPS's current efforts to obtain renewed funding.

Learning Disabilities Programs

The MPS provide five programs for students with special learning and behavior problems (SLBP). These programs are for socially maladjusted, educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, trainable mentally retarded and seriously emotionally disturbed students.

In reviewing the most recent enrollment data for SLBP programs, the Task Force confronted a glaring reality -- a disproportionate number of Black and Indian students are currently attending SLBP programs. As Table II indicates, 26.8% of the students in these programs are Black, 1.5 times the percentage of Blacks in the student body; 8.1% are Indian, 1.4 times the percentage of Indians in the student body. In all but the trainable mentally retarded program, the percentage of Black students in the SLBP programs exceeds their percentage in the study body; the same is true for Indians in all but the seriously emotionally distrubed program. The data indicate that Chicano/

Latinos are enrolled in SLBP programs in approximately the same proporations as they are in all school programs.

Table II: SLBP Program Enrollment

Category	Black	Indians	Chicano/ Latino	Total
Total Portion of School Population	17.6% 8,023	5.6% 2,573	1.4% 614	100% 45,610
Learning Disability Classification				
Socially Maladjuated	18.3% 60	9.5% 31	1.2% 4	100% 327
Educable Mentally Retarded	29.9 186	7.2% 45	1.17% 7	100% 623
Learning Disabled	33.0% 434	9.5% 125	1.6% 21	100% 1,317
Trainable Mentally Retarded	13.5% 31	6.1% 14	1.3% 3	100% 230
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed	18.4% 90	5.3% 26	0.8% 4	100% 488
Total of Students With Learning Disability	26.8% 801	8.1% 241	1.3% 39	100% 2,985
Percentage of Students of Particular Racial Category	10.0%	9.4%	6.4%	

Source: MPS Department of Special Education, October, 1978, based on October, 1978, sight count, the latest available.

A study prepared by the Psychological Services Department of the MPS, Minority Status, Sex, and School Psychological Services,[12] suggests some reasons for this pattern of program enrollment. For purposes of this study, Blacks, Indians and Orientals were considered minorities. Among the major findings were:

1) "A significantly higher percentage of the minority student population (2.9%) were referred for psychological services than of the major student population (1.6%)." The total minority percentage of the referring schools was 34%, while the minority percentage of students referred for psychological services from these schools was 48%. . ."
2) "Psychologists made contact with parents of majority students significantly more often (58%). . .than with parents of minority students (41%). . ."
3) Recommendations to parents of minority students most commonly involved program placement, while recommendations to parents of majority students varied across all six categories of treatment (program placement, behavior management, help at home, counseling, social groups and self-concept/attitudes).[13]

This study suggested that teachers' bias may be the source of the disproportionate program referrals, because "those schools referring the lowest percentage of minority students had been integrated the longest."[14]

The fact that school psychologists met less frequently with minority parents was attributed to a variety of factors including parents' discomfort, communication and transportation problems, and the discomfort of school psychologists in meeting with minority parents.

The disproportionate rate of referrals to programs suggests the possibility that the MPS use such programs as a "dumping ground" for non-white students who do not conform to a white middle class behavior stereotype. Non-conformity is labeled as a "behavior problem."

The Task Force believes that these enrollment data and the referral study suggest the possibility of a systematic pattern of misdiagnosis and mislabeling of Black and Indian students and potential abuse of the SLBP system by school personnel.

Dr. Frank Wilderson of the University of Minnesota, who has done extensive research on this subject, offered several explanations in discussion before the Task Force:

1) Many children who are honestly reacting to stress and personal relationships are diagnosed within the school setting as emotionally disturbed or afflicted with behavioral problems.
2) Racial bias in the formal and informal criteria used by teachers and diagnosticians can play a major role in making such referrals. School personnel may misinterpret "acting out" behavior as hyperactivity or passivity as a learning disability when such actions may actually be natural and appropriate for a child.
3) Majority parents may be less accepting of having their children labelled as needing special education, resulting in a lower rate of SLBP program enrollment.

Further complicating the problem of misdiagnosis is the operation of an administrative quota on the number of minority students in SLBP

programs. Judge Larson's various desegregation orders did not establish a limit on the percentage of non-white students in the various SLBP programs. The current school administration has, however, imposed a limit of 46% and distributed the number of eligible slots among the three areas.

While the Task Force believes there is evidence of misdiagnosis, it also questions the imposition of the quota. A quota in conjunction with misdiagnosis could easily result in a pattern of inappropriate referrals and treatment, i.e., referrals of misdiagnosed non-white students and denial of services to non-white students with a real need.

Upper Level Courses

Another indicator of the MPS's failure to provide a quality education to Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students is the low percentage enrollment of such students in upper level courses. Documentation of this pattern in mathematics courses was provided in a 1976 MPS study, Secondary Math Course Survey.[15] The study found that Blacks were significantly over-represented in the most fundamental or remedial and under-represented in higher level college preparatory courses. Indian students were disproportionately enrolled in "Discover Math," a lower intermediate level course. In this study, as in many others, there were no data regarding Chicano/Latino students.

MPS's Concept of Student Achievement

The manner in which the MPS puts into daily operation its conception of student achievement is another course of difficulty for Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students. Program requirements and policy guidelines, the cornerstones of most administrative systems, are the instruments used

by the MPS to translate the system's concept into operational terms.

Several examples of MPS's policies are, in the judgment of the Task Force, detrimental to non-white students.

1) The Advancement/Retention Policy states: Children may be advanced academically at any time when the best interests of the child will be served. Pupils may be retained if the best interests of the pupil would be served by this action.[16] This vague policy of "social promotion" provides no guarantee that basic skills have been acquired by a student before moving from one grade to the next. Because the MPS collects no information on the rate of social promotion, there is no way of knowing how many students, in particular, how many non-white students, are being socially promoted. This policy and the lack of data represent another way in which the school system sheds responsibility for performance.
2) The MPS's testing pattern permits students to graduate from high school without frequent interim or final competency testing in the basic skills. This lack of testing is particularly harmful due to the policy and practice of social promotion.
3) Currently a student can graduate from high school with only 45 trimester credits (a trimester credit is earned for one period of study daily for one trimester, 60 school days). Twenty-one of the 45 trimester credits are on an elective basis, i.e., any course of the student's choosing can fulfill the requirement.

Of the 45 credits, only three are required in mathematics or science. Ninth grade is the last grade in which a mathematics course is required.[17] A student can thus go through his/her entire high school career without taking a mathematics course.

4) Another area of difficulty within the MPS is the sketchy and discretionary nature of the policies and practices of reporting student progress to parents.

The policy for elementary schools states:

> Progress reports to parents of elementary school children are made three times during the school year. A group conference is suggested (emphasis added) as a fourth report but is a school option.[18]

The policy for junior and senior high schools states:

> Reports of student's progress are issued at regular intervals during the school year. Notices of unsatisfactory progress are sent home whenever necessary.[19]

Combined with the lack of information concerning course objectives, these policies often leave parents without information regarding the rate at which their children are progressing.

5) Current school system policies provide that parent-teacher conferences are optional and scheduled at the teachers' discretion, except for kindergarten students. Conferences can be held via the telephone and at the teachers' convenience, whether or not the proposed schedule is convenient for parents. While the Task Force has stressed the need to place on the schools primary responsibility for providing students a quality

education, it does not deny the importance of parental involvement. On the contrary, the Task Force takes the position that parents should play a greater role than that of passive recipients of information identified as valuable by school personnel. Active parental involvement in the education of children through understanding of program goals, receipt of progress reports and conferences with teachers, particularly at the elementary school level, is deemed essential by the Task Force.

Student Testing Program

At the present time the MPS provides no adequate procedure that consistently measures and reports the level of achievement of individual students. As a result, students, teachers and parents all lack adequate information concerning how a student is progressing. The lack of information makes it difficult to hold the school system or individual teachers accountable for lack of progress. The need for remedial action often goes undetected for critical lengths of time. For these basic reasons, the Task Force has concluded that an extensive effort to increase and improve the student testing system in the MPS is required.

Realizing that education testing is a highly technical endeavor, the Task Force has adopted recommendations that fall short of describing a fully elaborated system of student testing for the MPS. That task is for the professional educators in the school system working with extensive community input. Instead, the Task Force has chosen to offer the following basic principles upon which a system should be based.

1) Testing for mastery of basic skills should be given primary emphasis. This principle is consistent with the Task Force's emphasis on basic skills throughout this report.

2) Testing should be done at all grades in at least the basic skills areas. In this way deficiencies could be identified early in a student's career and proper remedial action could be taken.

3) The testing should serve as the primary basis for promotion from grade to grade at all levels. This policy would replace the current vague policy of social promotion and prevent students from reaching intermediate and upper grades with few if any skills. Once students get to that stage, the school system has great difficulty in meeting their educational needs.

4) The proposed testing program should include a combination of norm-referenced and criterion-referenced* examinations. Each type of examination has its merits.

---

*Criterion-referenced tests are constructed so they: a) measure each student's progress toward explicit course objectives and mastering of material taught in a specific time frame; b) identify needed additional study; and, c) provide teachers, children, and parents a clear idea as to where they stand in relation to course material. Norm-referenced tests are constructed so they: a) measure students' achievement in relation to each other rather than in an individualized manner; and b) compare all students tested to a norm group to which the test was standardized. (Based on William F. Brazzil, "Criterion Referenced Tests," Today's Education NEA Journal, November, 1972.)

The use of criterion-referenced testing would permit measurement of specific, predetermined learner outcomes, while norm-referenced tests provide a means of comparing the performance of Minneapolis students with other students from around the country. Thus, the Task Force believes that some balance must be struck between these two types of tests.

5) Required passage of a minimum competency test in the basic skills prior to graduation would help assure that graduates of the MPS have at least minimal mastery of basic skills. It could, however, create serious problems for non-white students because of cultural bias in the test and the school systems failure to provide non-white students with an adequate education.

The Task Force carefully evaluated the potential harm to Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students of a final competency examination. The Task Force examined the experience in Florida, where the vast majority of students failing the test were non-whites.

The judgment of the Task Force was that careful development and testing of the competency examination to eliminate cultural bias and successful implementation of an interim testing program, personnel evaluation system and system accountability mechanism (discussed in later sections) would substantially reduce the risk of victimizing non-white students. Without all of these safeguards, however, the Task Force would oppose a minimum competency examination requirement. If phased in after

the interim testing program were operating for several years, the final competency test would not represent an unfair barrier to a diploma for students now in the upper grades who neither expected such a test nor benefit from the "early learning" provided by an interim testing program. In combination with other tests, the evaluation of personnel and the system, this test would not function as a lowest common denominator of achievement toward which students, personnel and the system itself would gravitate. Instead it would serve as a further guarantee that the MPS was indeed educating all students in the basic skills.

Non-White Teachers

The Task Force believes that a high proportion of non-white staff members is critical to non-white student achievement in the MPS. It likewise asserts that the MPS bears a special responsibility to attain this goal.

State law now permits all school districts except Duluth, St. Paul and Minneapolis to deviate from a strict seniority dismissal policy to implement affirmative action plans. In Duluth, St. Paul and Minneapolis, however, seniority is the sole basis for determining which teachers are retained.[20]

Because of this statute, the burden of recent staff reductions has been disproportionately borne by non-white teachers, many of whom were hired during the last ten years. Projections for the near future indicate a similar pattern will eme

Before the current school year a net total of 102 teachers was laid off. Of these, 24.5% (25) were non-whites, despite the fact that they constituted only 8.4% of all teachers. Projections for the coming school year indicate that 21.7% of all layoffs will be non-white teachers, clearly a disproportionate share. This pattern is even more disturbing because it emerges at a time when the non-white portion of the student body has increased from 24.5% to 26.1%. It is projected to increase even more in the future.[21]

MPS Teacher Layoffs

	1977 - 78			1978 - 79		
	STUDENTS	TEACHERS[1]	LAYOFFS[2] FOR 78-79	STUDENTS	TEACHERS	LAYOFFS[3] FOR 79-80
WHITES	37,269 75.6%	2,860 91.6%	77 75.4%	33,721 73.9%	2,525 91.5%	180 78.2%
NON-WHITES	12,037 24.4%	264 8.4%	25 24.5%	11,889 26.1%	235 8.5%	50 21.7%
TOTAL	49,306 100%	3,124 100%	102 100%	45,610 100%	2,760 100%	230 100%

[1]Teachers of full-time equivalent status.

[2]Net change after initial firings and rehirings.

[3]As of May 8 meeting of Board of Education. Thus, it includes no adjustment for rehirings.

Source: Computation from Official Sight Count Data, 1977-78, 1978-79, layoff data from Personnel Department, Minneapolis Public Schools.

Student Achievement Recommendations

1. The basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics must be given top priority throughout the elementary and secondary grades.
2. "Social promotion" of students as a policy and practice of the MPS must be ended. Specific standards for grade-to-grade promotion and graduation must be established. Graduation requirements should be phased in with a system of interim testing.
3. A regular, comprehensive system of student testing in the basic skills beginning in the early grades must be established. In order to avoid a "blame-the-victim" interpretation of the results, i.e., blaming students alone for their failure to achieve, this system of testing must be directly linked to rigorous personnel evaluation and system accountability processes. The testing system should incorporate the following features:
   a. An interim testing program should be conducted at all grade levels and serve as the basis for promotion and identify the need for remedial action.
   b. The interim testing program should strike an appropriate balance between norm-referenced and criterion-referenced examinations.
   c. A final competency examination that all students must pass prior to graduation should be instituted if the following requirements designed to protect students are also met:
      1) Careful development and testing of the examination to eliminate cultural bias,
      2) Full implementation for several years of the interim testing program; and
      3) Implementation of personnel evaluation

and system accountability mechanisms
tied directly to school achievement.

4. A regular, systematic follow-up of individual dropouts must be instituted to provide appropriate services to the dropouts and analyze what causes a disproportionate number of non-white youth to drop out.
5. An extensive effort beginning in the early grades to guide more non-white students into higher level courses of all kinds, and in particular into mathematics and science, should be instituted. Use of other students who have taken such courses should be tested.
6. The MPS must explain the disproportionate number of non-white students who are being placed in SLBP programs. In its explanation the MPS should: a) assess the level of misdiagnosis and mislabelling of minority students; b) see what is being done to maximize the appropriate diagnosis and referral of minority students SLBP programs; and c) identify how the desegregation quota actually operates for SLBP programs to insure appropriate referrals of minority students.
7. Individual conferences between parents and elementary school teachers must be mandatory for teachers and scheduled at a time convenient to working parents.

Part III: EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

The Task Force was particularly frustrated and discouraged in its inquiry into performance evaluation of teachers, principals and administrators. At a time when most public and private sector endeavors are facing demands for increasing accountability, public education seems aloof and unapproachable.

This situation is likewise frustrating and discouraging for the capable and dedicated teachers, principals and administrators employed by the MPS. The absence of an effective system for evaluating their performance of school personnel often victimizes them as it does students and parents.

The Task Force is not suggesting that an evaluation system is needed solely because of a general lack of competence or performance on the part of some school personnel. On the contrary, the Task Force asserts that an effective evaluation system is needed to provide a basis for establishing a structure of incentives and rewards for superior performance as well as to provide a basis for action in cases of substandard performance.

The Task Force's frustration stemmed from many things. During the course of its meetings, the Task Force:

1) Learned that only three tenured teachers have been terminated for incompetency during the last ten years.
2) Heard members of the MPS administration criticize the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers (MFT) for its apparent willingness to defend any and all teachers against disciplinary charges. At the same time

Chart I: Formal Evaluation Procedures in MPS

	Evaluator	Frequency	Elements	Content	Outcomes
Probationary Teacher	Principal or Assistant Principal	Once per year for 3 years. (probationary period)	Principal must submit written evaluation form to appropriate Area Superintendent Based upon a suggested minimum of three visits to classroom (form includes dates and duration of visits and conferences)	-Evaluation form consists of combination of principal's comments and multiple ratings in the following categories: a. Relationship to pupils, staff and parents b. Personal qualities c. Learning activities -No objective criteria -No parental input	Tenure/No Tenure Decision Identification of teaching problems in first two years
Tenured Teacher	Principal or Assistant Principal	Once every other year	One or more of the following must be submitted to the appropriate Area Superintendent: a. written evaluation of teaching effectiveness b. summary of principal-teacher conference regarding teaching effectiveness c. summary of observation conducted while teacher was working with students. Need not include visit to classroom.	-Evaluation form asks for comments on one or more of the following items: a. "General Observations of Effectiveness of Teacher" b. "Specific Observations of Effective Teaching Based on Classroom Visitation" c. "Suggestions for Improvement in Overall Performance" d. "Suggestions for Improvement Based upon Classroom Visitation" -No guidance whatsoever regarding bases for comment. -No objective criteria. -No parental input.	Little real use No binding recommendation

Principals, Supervisors, Superintendents, Counselors, Social Workers and other certificated personnel except teachers.

There is no formal process of evaluating any certificated employees other than teachers. There is an optional procedure for teachers to evaluate principals, but the practice is rare.

administrators cited the enormous cost in terms of time and money required to document even a single case of incompetence or poor performance.

3) Heard representatives of the MFT claim the current evaluation system is conceptually sound but charge that principals simply were not implementing it. They likewise expressed doubts about the ability of the principals to administer the system.
4) Was told teachers often fill out their own evaluation forms.
5) Heard an Area Superintendent say that he had been evaluated only once since 1963.
6) Learned that not a single evaluation-related recommendation of the last major effort by the MPS itself to reform the evaluation system, the Accountability Project,[23] was adopted.
7) Noted the absence of a system of incentives and rewards for superior performance.

Chart I summarizes the major features of the current evaluation system of the MPS.

The primary emphasis of the current evaluation system is clearly on the probationary period. A statement by a representative of the MFT included in the report of the Accountability Project on Teacher Evaluation suggests this focus. "Duds should be identified during the probationary period. . .the principal should not vacillate at that point. But if a teacher has taught 25 years and time has passed him by, what do you do? Change assignment? Retire? Assign him to an office?"[24] This emphasis

may have been appropriate during times of growth, but is out-of-date and inappropriate at a time when tenured personnel are being dismissed due to declining enrollment.

The lack of an effective system for evaluation of tenured teachers, the largest group of certificated employees and the people closest to the students, is by far the most alarming evaluation issue to the Task Force. Formal evaluation by the principal or assistant principal is required only every other year; it need not be based upon a classroom visit; and it includes no parental input. Moreover, as stated in the 1977-79 teachers contract, its goal is "to promote a higher level of effectiveness of each teacher's performance."[25] Thus, there is no emphasis placed on the identification and dismissal of incompetent or ineffective teachers. There is likewise no mechanism for rewarding an exceptional teacher.

The lack of specific evaluation criteria makes it unlikely that the evaluation could be used for these purposes anyway, except in cases of flagrant behavior by the teacher. The evaluation form (copy included as Appendix A) itself dramatizes the general nature of the evaluation. It has space for comments regarding four broad areas, as shown in the chart. It contains nothing regarding student achievement, asks only for suggestions for improvement and requires no binding recommendations from the principal. The Task Force was told that the evaluations are given perfunctory review by supervisors and basically filed away.

A variety of factors mitigate against the implementation of an effective evaluation system. Foremost among them is the Minnesota Teacher Tenure Act, which provides the basis for both the tenure and seniority dismissal system of the MPS. This law makes it extremely difficult to dismiss any incompetent tenured teacher or administrator.

The Task Force believes protection of academic freedom must be at the heart of any tenure provisions. However, prossession of tenure must not be interpreted as immunization against accountability or evaluation of performance, which now seems to be the case in MPS.

The result of these factors appears to be an educational system devoid of incentives to improve the quality of teaching and likewise devoid of incentives to supervise or evaluate effectively the results of teaching.

The Task Force could conclude, based on the relevant policies, forms, and reported usage, that the evaluation of tenured teachers is currently an almost useless process in relation to the educational needs of students in the MPS. The same is true of the evaluation of other certificated employees.

The combined power position of the teachers union, the protection of the Teacher Tenure Act and the contract, and the lack of reward mechanism have created a general administrative attitude within the MPS that evaluation and accountability are impossible to achieve. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy: If evaluation is impossible and useless, then there is no need to measure educational achievement and no way to be accountable to accessible to parents, students and the general public.

The Education Task Force rejects this "prophecy" and suggests that it be identified for what it is: a system to protect school personnel from scrutiny by parents and students; and more seriously, a rationalization for the failure of the system to provide adequate educational services to students.

Operating Evaluation Models

In its research the Task Force examined a number of evaluation systems now in operation in public school systems. The Seattle, Washington and

Salt Lake City, Utah systems emerged as the best working models that responded to at least some of the deficiencies of the MPS system. These systems are described briefly below.

Seattle, Washington

In Seattle teachers are not given re-employment preference based upon seniority. Instead, each teacher signs a one-year contract and is presumed to have that contract renewed unless a non-renewal notice is sent in accordance with the state's "continuing contract" statute.

Attention to the non-renewal process is given as soon as school begins each September. Time deadlines must be met to (1) allow early notice of a teacher's deficiencies, (2) provide ample time for improvement, and (3) assure teachers of full statutory protection prior to non-renewal.

All "certified non-supervisory educational employees" are evaluated on at least two separate occasions for a total period of not less than 60 minutes per year. This evaluation is based upon the following criteria: 1) instructional skill, 2) classroom management, 3) professional preparation and scholarship, 4) effort toward improvement, 5) handling of student discipline and attendance problems, 6) interest in teaching pupils, 7) knowledge of subject matter, and 8) professional responsibility. When a teacher's performance is unsatisfactory according to one of these criteria, an annual performance evaluation is conducted. This evaluation can lead to remedial effort by the teacher, transfer or dismissal.

Salt Lake City, Utah

In Salt Lake City all certified employees, including teachers, principals and administrators, write out personal accountability plans in relation

to their students. These plans list goals and objectives for the school year.

The objectives are developed further during meetings and conferences held between employees and supervisors, when long-range plans are developed with specific objectives. These plans are distributed to parents so that they know what their children are studying in school. These plans are also used by supervisors to evaluate the progress each employee is making toward meeting his/her objectives. If progress is unsatisfactory, the employee is so advised and placed on informal remediation -- a simple warning that improvement is needed. If no improvement occurs, formal remediation is requested.

When a principal, for example, requests formal remediation for a teacher, the area superintendent relays the request to a district learning specialist. This specialist gathers a team consisting of the specialist, principal, peer of teacher, teachers union representative and representative from a parents group. This team becomes responsible for developing activities for helping the teacher meet the instructional objectives identified in his/her earlier plan. This may involve further discussions with a learning specialist and other members of the team, help in designing lesson plans or special coursework.

The teacher is helped for two months until a second meeting of the "team" decides if remediation succeeded. The remediation period can also be extended another three months. If, at that time, the team decides remediation has failed, a termination process is begun.

Evaluation Recommendations

1. Systematic evaluation of the performance of teachers, principals and administrators of the MPS must become a priority of the school system.
2. A regular systematic evaluation of all teachers must be instituted.
   a. The purpose of evaluation should be:
      1) to reinforce good teaching;
      2) to identify problems facing teachers;
      3) to provide teachers with assistance in addressing problems and increasing their effectiveness; and
      4) to provide a means of transferring or terminating those teachers who are not performing adequately.
   b. The individual principal would have the final responsibility for implementing the teacher evaluation system in each school.
   c. Evaluations should be conducted on the basis of:
      1) quantifiable objectives for student progress in each area of study, the primary criterion, and
      2) teaching performance.
   d. Participants in the evaluation process should be:
      1) supervisors;
      2) peers of teachers; and
      3) parents.

3. A comparable and equally rigorous process of evaluation of all other certificated employees must be instituted with student achievement as the primary criterion. Administrators must be reviewed on how students under their supervision are achieving. A modified but similar form of evaluation of counselors and other certificated employees must also be instituted.
4. The MPS should initiate a system of renewable contracts for certificated personnel coordinated with a rigorous evaluation, based in large part on student achievement. Due process guarantees should be maintained.
5. The MPS must assume responsibility for having all principals and administrators be skilled in the requisite techniques of measurement and evaluation.
6. Achievement data based upon race and other relevant groups must be collected to gauge achievement by all students and to permit an adequate assessment of MPS personnel and the school system itself in their provision of a quality education to Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students.

Part IV: System Accountability

While the Minneapolis Public School system is quite responsive to political and economic pressures, such as property tax issues, state aids, school closings, declining enrollments and contract negotiations, there exists no clearly discernable mechanism of accountability for matters of educational quality and student achievement, particularly for non-white students. The Task Force believes there is a need for a process whereby the MPS could be held accountable on an ongoing, systematic basis for the quality of education it is providing. Without such a mechanism educational quality will continue to be relegated to a secondary level of importance. The nature of public decision-making processes makes it inevitable.

The Task Force recognizes the recently enacted Planning, Evaluating and Reporting (PER) Act as a forward-looking piece of state educational planning legislation. The PER system offers great potential for instilling in the MPS a modicum of accountability. As presently structured, however, PER is not adequate to provide the level of accountability deemed necessary by the Task Force for several reasons:

1) PER committees are often only renamed PTSA groups. According to the PER plan adopted by the Minneapolis school district,. . ."Local schools may use existing advisory committees or form new ones at the option of the PTSA." Historically, these groups have involved few non-white parents and failed, in the estimation of the Task Force, to address the special needs of students not being adequately served by the school system.

2) Current PER goals are too general and subjective to permit a tough assessment of the level of attainment by each unit of the school system and school personnel.

3) PER goals also fail to distinguish among the various groups of students within the MPS. By addressing overall levels of achievement the goals fail to provide specific school accountability for the performance of groups of students often encountering difficulty, such as non-white or lower income students. Thus, such goals permit the perpetuation of the MPS's denial of responsibility for the education of these students. A report that Profiles of Performance will be used to satisfy the student achievement reporting requirement only confirms the Task Force's sense that the student achievement goals "planned, evaluated and reported" under PER are insufficient to the needs of large numbers of students.

4) The PER system is not linked in any substantive way to the evaluation of school personnel. As noted in the previous section, evaluation of all school personnel is considered crucial by the Task Force. One effective way to assure the implementation of system-wide goals is to evaluate all personnel against such goals.

After examining this issue the Task Force has concluded that a "management-by-objectives (MBO)" approach would be most appropriate. As visualized by the Task Force, this approach would consist of four steps: 1) goal and objective setting, 2) program development, 3) evaluation, and 4) reporting. As in all MBO systems, the Board of Education, administrators, principals and teachers must commit to a specified, measurable level of achievement. At the end of the agreed upon period

an assessment of the level of achievement would be made at each unit in the school system. Parents and the general community would receive these commitments and participate in the assessment.

Formal implementation of this kind of process would help assure that educational quality would not be relegated to a secondary status. By specifying measurable educational achievement goals the accountability mechanism would initiate a process whereby the three areas, individual schools within each area and each individual classroom could contribute and be evaluated in relation to the goals. Moreover, the evaluation of personnel could then be integrated into a clearly delineated set of achievement objectives.

System Accountability Recommendations

1. A management-by-objective model of education planning and evaluation must be adopted by the MPS as a means of holding the school system accountable to the community for the provision of a quality education to all students. The crucial feature of this model as applied in the MPS would be the public commitment of the school system to the attainment of a set of goals. The performance of the MPS would then be judge in relation to these goals.
2. The MBO model could be implemented as a supplement to the existing PER system or as a separate activity.
3. Student achievement goals established in this process would have the following characteristics:
   a. Goals would be established by the Board of Education and the school administration in consultation with the public and made applicable to all major units within the school system. There would be, in effect, a top-down-and-back

pattern of operation. Goals would be established for the system; responsibility for attainment of the goals would be allocated to all major units within the system, i.e., all three areas, each individual school and individual classrooms would each be assigned to achieve a specified portion of the system-wide goal.

b. Goals would concentrate on basic skills.

c. Goals would be quantified. This characteristic would permit measurement of the degree of attainment at all levels.

d. Goals would be specified for major subgroups within the student body as well as for the student body as a whole. Particular attention and specific targets would be set for groups of students when the system is failing. For example, the system-wide goal for all students might be to raise reading levels by one grade during the coming year; while the goal for Indian students might be to raise their reading levels by 1.8 years.

e. Goals must be ambitious but attainable. The Task Force stressed that the school system should not be permitted by the community to establish unacceptably low goals.

4. Goals pertaining to subjects other than student achievement could also be established as part of the annual process. These goals could pertain to such things as maintenance of non-white staff or school closings. Primary emphasis throughout the system should remain, hwoever, on the student achievement goals.

5. The evaluation component of the program would consist of two major elements:

a. Assessment of the level of attainment of goals at all levels within the school system.

b. Integration of goal attainment levels in the evaluation of all school personnel.

Both represent major steps beyond PER. The quantification of the goals would permit less subjective assessment of performance. The integration of goal attainment levels would permit evaluation of performance in relation to the goals at all levels, from the superintendent to individual teachers.

6. The community involvement component would consist of three major improvements over PER:

a. Increased participation by parents of students who are not being served by the system should be mandated by requiring concerted action by the school system to go beyond old PTSA groups to form PER committees.

b. More substantive community scrutiny of goals and performance levels would result from the requirement that both the setting of quantified goals and the reporting process involve parents at all levels in the system.

c. Progress reports to parents on a child's performance would be related to individual course goals. This feature would provide a means of direct parental involvement at the most basic level, the individual student.

PART V: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

A common theme running throughout this report is the need for improvement in the quantity and quality of parental involvement in the educational process. The Task Force believes parental involvement is such an important concept that a recapitulation of all related recommendations is now appropriate.

Student Achievement:

Individual conferences between parents and elementary school teachers must be mandated for teachers and scheduled at a time convenient to working parents.

Evaluation of Certificated Personnel:

Participants in the evaluation process should be supervisors, peers of teachers and parents.

System Accountability

The community involvement component is comprised of three major improvements over PER:

a. Increased participation of parents of students who are not being served by the system should be mandated by requiring concerted action by the school system to go beyond old PTSA groups to form PER committees.

b. More substantive community scrutiny of goals and performance levels would result from the requirement that both

the setting of quantified goals and the reporting process involve parents at all levels in the system.

c. Progress reports to parents on a child's performance would be related to individual course goals. This feature would provide a means of direct parental involvement at the most basic level, the individual student.

PART VI: SUMMARY OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS

Student Achievement Recommendations

1. The basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics must be given top priority throughout the elementary and secondary grades.
2. "Social promotion" of students as a policy and practice of the MPS must be ended. Specific standards for grade-to-grade promotion and graduation must be established. Graduation requirements should be phased in with a system of interim testing.
3. A regular, comprehensive system of student testing in the basic skills beginning in the early grades must be established. In order to avoid a "blame-the-victim" interpretation of the results, i.e., blaming students alone for their failure to achieve, this system of testing must be directly linked to rigorous personnel evaluation and system accountability processes. The testing system should incorporate the following features:
   a. An interim testing program should be conducted at all grade levels and serve as the basis for promotion and identify the need for remedial action.
   b. The interim testing program should strike an appropriate balance between norm-referenced and criterion-referenced examinations.
   c. A final competency examination that all students must pass prior to graduation should be instituted if the following requirements designed to protect students are also met:

1) Careful development and testing of the examination to eliminate cultural bias;
2) Full implementation for several years of the interim testing program; and
3) Implementation of personnel evaluation and system accountability mechanisms tied directly to school achievement.

4. A regular, systematic follow-up of individual dropouts must be instituted to provide appropriate services to the dropouts and analyze what causes a disproportionate number of non-white youth to drop out.
5. An extensive effort beginning in the early grades to guide more non-white students into higher level courses of all kinds, and in particular into mathematics and science, should be instituted. Use of other students who have taken such courses should be tested.
6. The MPS must explain the disproportionate number of non-white students who are being placed in SLBP programs. In its explanation the MPS should: a) assess the level of misdiagnosis and mislabelling of minority students; b) see what is being done to maximize the appropriate diagnosis and referral of minority students SLBP programs; and c) identify how the desegregation quota actually operates for SLBP programs to insure appropriate referrals of minority students.
7. Individual conferences between parents and elementary school teachers must be mandatory for teachers and scheduled at a time convenient to working parents.

Evaluation Recommendations

1. Systematic evaluation of the performance of teachers, principals

and administrators of the MPS must become a priority of the school system.

2. A regular systematic evaluation of all teachers must be instituted.
   a. The purpose of evaluation should be:
      1) to reinforce good teaching;
      2) to identify problems facing teachers;
      3) to provide teachers with assistance in addressing problems and increasing their effectiveness; and
      4) to provide a means of transferring or terminating those teachers who are not performing adequately.
   b. The individual principal would have the final responsibility for implementing the teacher evaluation system in each school.
   c. Evaluations should be conducted on the basis of:
      1) quantifiable objectives for student progress in each area of study, the primary criterion; and
      2) teaching performance.
   d. Participants in the evaluation process should be:
      1) supervisors;
      2) peers of teachers; and
      3) parents.
3. A comparable and equally rigorous process of evaluation of all other certificated employees must be instituted with student achievement as the primary criterion. Administrators must be reviewed on how students under their supervision are achieving. A modified

but similar form of evaluation of counselors and other certificated employees must also be instituted.

4. The MPS should initiate a system of renewable contracts for certificated personnel coordinated with a rigorous evaluation, based in large part on student achievement. Due process guarantees should be maintained.
5. The MPS must assume responsibility for having all principals and administrators be skilled in the requisite techniques of measurement and evaluation.
6. Achievement data based upon race and other relevant groups must be collected to gauge achievement by all students and to permit an adequate assessment of MPS personnel and the school system itself in their provision of a quality education to Black, Indian and Chicano/Latino students.

System Accountability Recommendations

1. A management-by-objective model of educational planning and evaluation must be adopted by the MPS as a means of holding the school system accountable to the community for the provision of a quality education to all students. The crucial feature of this model as applied in the MPS would be the public commitment of the school system to the attainment a set of goals. The performance of the MPS would then be judged in relation to these goals.
2. The MBO model could be implemented as a supplement to the existing PER system or as a separate activity.
3. Student achievement goals established in this process would have the following characteristics:

a. Goals would be established by the Board of Education and the school administration in consultation with the public and made applicable to all major units within the school system. There would be, in effect, a top-down-and-back pattern of operation. Goals would be established for the system; responsibility for attainment of the goals would be allocated to all major units within the system, i.e., all three areas, each individual school and individual classrooms would each be assigned to achieve a specified portion of the system-wide goal.

b. Goals would concentrate on basic skills.

c. Goals would be quantified. This characteristic would permit measurement of the degree of attainment at all levels.

d. Goals would be specified for major subgroups within the student body as well as for the student body as a whole. Particular attention and specific targets would be set for groups of students when the system is failing. For example, the system-wide goal for all students might be to raise reading levels by one grade during the coming year; while the goal for Indian students might be to raise their reading levels by 1.8 years.

e. Goals must be ambitious but attainable. The Task Force stressed that the school system should not be permitted by the community to establish unacceptably low goals.

4. Goals pertaining to subjects other than student achievement could also be established as part of the annual process. These goals

could pertain to such things as maintenance of non-white staff or school closings. Primary emphasis throughout the system should remain, however, on the student achievement goals.

5. The evaluation component of the program would consist of two major elements:

   a. Assessment of the level of attainment of goals at all levels within the school system.

   b. Integration of goal attainment levels in the evaluation of all school personnel.

   Both represent major steps beyond PER. The quanitification of the goals would permit less subjective assessment of performance. The integration of goal attainment levels would permit evaluation of performance in relation to the goals at all levels, from the superintendent to individual teachers.

6. The community involvement component would consist of three major improvements over PER:

   a. Increased participation by parents of students who are not being served by the system should be mandated by requiring concerted action by the school system to go beyond old PTSA groups to form PER committees.

   b. More substantive community scrutiny of goals and performance levels would result from the requirement that both the setting of quanitified goals and the reporting process involve parents at all levels in the system.

   c. Progress reports to parents on a child's performance would be related to individual course goals. This

feature would provide a means of direct parental involvement at the most basic level. the individual student.

FOOTNOTES

[1]James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, (Washington, D. C., 1966).

[2]Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University, Schools That Work, (Washington, D. C., 1978).

[3]MPS Office of Guidance and Assessment, Profiles of Performance in the Minneapolis Public Schools, (Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1979).

[4]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[5]Nancy Paulu, "City Pupil Test Scores Higher or Hold Level," Minneapolis Star, Janury 31, 1979.

[6]Profiles, p. 14.

[7]Ibid., p. 14

[8]Ibid., p. 12.

[9]Ibid., p. 19.

[10]MPS Office of Guidance and Assessment, Progress Report on Minneapolis School Dropout Study, (Minneapolis, 1974).

[11]In a report entitled "Bridging the Gap," prepared by the Minnesota Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, the following data were compiled for Indian students:

MINNEAPOLIS STUDENT DATA

	1974		1976	
	Total	Indian	Total	Indian
Enrollment	54,613	2,792 (5.1%)	52,402	2,759 (5.3%)
Dropouts	2,166	111 (5.1%)	2,666	259 (9.7%)
Graduates	3,750	66 (1.8%)	3,356	37 (1.1%)
Suspensions	4,352	170 (5.5%)	Not Available	
Percent of 10th grade students enrolled in 1974 and dropped out by 1976			8%	33%

Sources: Elementary and Secondary Civil Rights Survey Fall 1974, Pupil-Personnel Sight Count, Oct. 19, 1976, and supplemental data provided by the Minneapolis Public Schools.

[12]Jerry R. Tomlinson, Nancy Acker, Andrea Carter and Sherrie Lindberg, "Minority Status, Sex and School Psychological Services," Psychology in the Schools, (Minneapolis, 1977), pp. 456-460.

[13]Ibid., p. 458.

[14]Ibid., p. 458.

[15]MPS Research and Evaluation Department, Secondary Math Course Survey, (Minneapolis, 1976).

[16]Minneapolis Public Schools, Policy 5310.

[17]Minneapolis Public Schools, Policy 6220 C.

[18]Ibid., Policy 5330 H.

[19]Ibid., Policy 5330 A.

[20]Minnesota Statutes 125.12 and 125.17

[21]MPS Personnel Department and Official Sight Count Data, 1977-78, 1978-79.

[22]H. F. 420, introduced by Ken Nelson, would allow Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth to maintain a specified percentage of minority personnel, in spite of basic seniority dismissal provisions of the law. The Teachers Union opposed this and other efforts to alter the tenure law.

[23]R. W. Faunce, Tracey Walen, The Minneapolis Accountability Project 1972-76 Final Report, (Minneapolis, 1977), pp. 60-63.

[24]Accountability Project, The Use of Teachers' Skills in the Minneapolis Schools, (Minneapolis, 1973), p. 21.

[25]Minneapolis Public Schools, Agreements, Policies and Administrative Regulations, July 1, 1977-1979, p. 69.

[26]Minneapolis Public Schools Department of Curriculum Services, The Minneapolis Plan for Implementing the New State "PER" Law, (Minneapolis, 1977). The Minnesota Legislature enacted PER (M.S. Chapter 271, Sections 1-7) in 1976, requiring every public school district to involve citizens in planning and evaluating instructional programs and reporting results of these programs to the public. Section 4 of the statute states: "All school districts in the state shall engage in planning, evaluation and reporting to the public ... during the 1978-79 school year, and submit a report, which has been shared with the public and adopted by the school board, to the state board of education by August 1, 1979."

Details of P.E.R. in Minneapolis (according to the local plan)

1. District-Wide P.E.R. Advisory Committee: The superintendent appoints a district-wide P.E.R. advisory committee to develop recommendations for a district instructional plan. Membership is drawn from community and staff (9 community members,

at least 3 recommended by area parent advisory councils; one curriculum professional, two principals and three teachers).

2. Program Objectives which support the district goals are developed by the Department of Curriculum Services.
3. Area Superintendents, working with advisory committees develop goals, objectives and procedures reflecting district wide goals.
4. Each school principal is responsible for developing the appropriate instructional plan and community for parents and staff members, should be designed and allowed to offer impact.

[27]Minneapolis Public Schools Department of Curriculum Services, The Minneapolis Plan for Implementing the New State "P.E.R." Law, (Minneapolis, 1977), p. 2.

Appendix A: Evaluation Form for Tenured Teachers

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Personnel Department

STATEMENT CONCERNING WORK OF TEACHER (TENURE)

Name _____ Grade or Subject _____

School _____ Year _____ Date of Appointment _____

One or more of the following items to be completed by administrator:

I. General Observations of Effectiveness of Teacher

II. Specific Observations of Effective Teaching Based on Classroom Visitation.

(over)

III. Suggestions for Improvement in Overall Performance

IV. Suggestions for Improvement Based on Classroom Visitation

Date of Visitation(s) _____ Date of Follow-up Conference(s) _____

Signature of Administrator _____ Date _____

Signature of Teacher _____ Date _____

Teacher's signature indicates only that he/she has seen the above statement, and does not necessarily imply agreement with the statement made by the administrator.

Comments of Teacher: (additional information may be attached if desired.)

PLEASE COMPLETE FOUR COPIES OF THIS FORM AND DISTRIBUTE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Filed in school office (white)
2. For the teacher (Green)
3. Sent to the appropriate associate superintendent or area administrator (Goldenrod)
4. Sent to the Personnel Department for teacher's personnel file (Yellow)

Resource Persons Who Assisted The Education Task Force

Minneapolis Public Schools:

Bob Rose - Teacher at Olson Junior High School;
President of Minneapolis Teachers' Federation

Norm Moen - Executive Secretary Minneapolis Teachers Federation

Mack Sirois - Acting Director of Personnel

Vern Indehar- Deputy Superintendent

Ray Arveson - Superintendent of Schools

Sharon Ireland - Lead Counselor in Guidance and Assessment

Ross Taylor - Director of Mathematics

Dave Roffers- Project Director of ESAA Dropout Program

Ron Davis - Coordinator of Learning Center for Economics

Richard Green- West Area Superintendent

Mel Hoagland - North Area Superintendent

Ken Northwick- East Area Superintendent

Alfredo Gonzalez - Bilingual Coordinator

Gail Hanson - Teacher on Special Assignment in Special Education Department

Dick Cornwell- Principal of Lyndale School

Larry Johnson- Researcher

Alberta Neal - Parent Education and Community Liaison Worker Coordinator

Sandra Rahl - Disseminator for Title I

Jean Hudson - East and West Area Coordinator For Title I

Tom Randall - Statistician

Peter Smith - Analyst

Seymour Yessner - Director for English and Humanities

Larry Harris - Coordinator of Legislative and Community Relations

Jerry Tomlinson - Chief Psychologist

Peter Smith - Analyst

August Rivera - Director of Information Services

Outside Resource Persons:

Robert Havighurst - Professor Emeritus in Education at University of Chicago

Katrina Green - Assistant Superintendent, St. Paul Public Schools

Tony Salinas - Director Heart of the Earth Survival School

Archie Holmes - Manager of Equal Educational Opportunities Section of State Department of Education

John Manning - Professor in Curriculum and Instruction; University of Minnesota

Fred Hayen - Director of Teaching Center; University of Minnesota

Bob Schreiner - Professor in Curriculum and Instruction; University of Minnesota

Jay Samuels - Professor in Social, Psychological, and Philosophical Foundations in Education, University of Minnesota

Frank Wilderson- Vice President Student Affairs; University of Minnesota

Gary Joselyn - Associate Professor in Student Counseling Bureau and Testing Consultant; University of Minnesota

Robert Crumpton - Personnel and Staff Training Officer; State Department of Educatio

Randall Johnson - Director of School Districts; State Department of Education

Louis Smerling - Minneapolis Representative on State Board of Education

George Rabehl - Director of Program Development; Osseo School District

Jan Hively - Former Director of Accountability Project; presently Deputy Director of Minneapolis City Planning Departmnet

Margo Stark - Citizen's League Committee on School Desegregation

Richard Faunce - Former Director of Research for Minneapolis Public Schools

Maxine Nathanson - Citizens Committee on Public Education

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American School Board Journal, "Where they not only evaluate teachers, they actually help the good ones and get rid of the bad ones," October, 1976.

Citizens League News, "Public Educators Facing Pressures From All Sides," April 17, 1978.

Citizens League, Accountability in Schools: Not A Threat But A Real Hope, Minneapolis, MN, November 22, 1972.

Cohen, Monroe, editor, Testing and Evaluation: New Views, Association for Childhood Education International. Washington, D. C. 1975.

Coleman, James S. et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Davies, Don, editor, Schools Where Parents Make A Difference, Institute For Responsive Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1976.

Dyer, Henry. How to Achieve Accountability in the Schools. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1973.

Ebel, Robert L, The Uses of Standardized Testing, Phi Delta Kappa, 1977.

Einstein, Elizabeth, "Classroom Dynamos," Human Behavior, April, 1979.

Grossmann, John. "This School Means What It Says," American Education, November 1978.

Institute for Educational Leadership, Schools That Work, George Washington University, 1978.

Jacobson, Lenore; Rosenthal, Robert. Pygmalion In The Classroom, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, Minneapolis City In Transition: Education, Minneapolis, MN., April 1979.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, Minnesotas Laws: Advantages, Disadvantages, Modifications, Alternatives - Collective Bargaining and Tenure, September, 1977.

Leles, Sam and Cruise, Robert, "Improving Eduational Evaluations by Appropriate Use of Knowledge Product and Performance Learnings," Educational Technology, January, 1976.

Levine, Daniel; Ornstein, Allan; and Wilkerson, Doxey; Reforming Metropolitan Schools. Goodyear Publishing, 1975.

Little, Gray, "The Seattle Plan: Evaluation Probation and Non-renewal of Certificated Teachers,"Seattle Public Schools, 1978.

Maeroff, Gene, "Removing Incompetent Teachers Is A Growing Problem for Schools", N. Y. Times, March 4, 1979.

Mannet, Richard, Evaluating Teacher Performance With Improved Rating Scales, Iowa State University, 1976.

Michigan Department of Education, The Michigan Accountability Model, Lansing, Michigan, 1978.

Minnesota Department of Education, A Resource Notebook For Classroom Teachers on Students with Handicaps in Regular Classes. Special Education Section, 1979.

Minnesota Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Bridging the Gap, 1976.

Mitchell, Richard, "Testing The Teachers", Atlantic Monthly, December 1978.

Morgan, Harry. "Teaching Blacks", New York Times, Nov. 29, 1978.

Nebgen, Mary K. "Parent Involvement in Title I Programs", Educational Forum, January, 1979.

Ovando, Carlos, editor, Cultural Pluralism", Educational Research Quarterly, Winter 1978.

Pine, Gerald, "Teacher Accountability: Myths and Realities", Educational Forum, November, 1976.

Robinson, Donald, "Accounting For Accountability", The High School Journal, October, 1976.

Publications of Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS)

Components of the 1978-79 General Fund Budget; Minneapolis: MPS, 1978.

Faunce, R. W. Attitudes and Characteristics of Effective and Not Effective Teachers of Culturally Disadvantaged Children. Mpls:MPS, 1970.

Hively, J. & Faunce, R. W. The Minneapolis Accountability Project: 1972-75 (three year report). Minneapolis: Minneapolis Public Schools, June 1975.

Minneapolis Accountability Project. Pupil progress reporting in the Minneapolis Schools. Minneapolis: Author, June 1973.

Minneapolis Accountability Project. The use of teachers' skills in the Minneapolis Schools. Minneapolis: Author, June 1973.

Minneapolis Accountability Project. Basic skills in the Minneapolis Schools. Minneapolis: Author, June 1974.

Minneapolis Accountability Project. Curriculum development procedures in the Minneapolis Schools. Minneapolis: Author, June 1974.

Minneapolis Accountability Project. Community participation in the Minneapolis Schools. Minneapolis: Author, May 1975.

Profiles of Performance in the Minneapolis Public Schools. Minneapolis: MPS, 1976.

Profiles of Performance in the Minneapolis Public Schools. Minneapolis: MPS, 1977.

Profiles of Performance in the Minneapolis Public Schools. Minneapolis: MPS, 1978.

Progress Report on Minneapolis School Dropout Study. Minneapolis: MPS, 1977.

Policies, Regulations, and By-Laws. Minneapolis Board of Education, Minneapolis, MPS, 1978.

"Preliminary Report of the Educational Planning Steering Committee to the Minneapolis Board of Education." November 2, 1978.

Pupil Personnel Sight Count. Minneapolis: MPS, 1977.

Pupil Personnel Sight Count. Minneapolis: MPS, 1978.

Witthun, Jan. Title IV, Part A Department of Indian Education Evaluation Report 1977-78. Minneapolis: MPS, September 1978.

URBAN COALITION OF MINNEAPOLIS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
1978 - 1979

(Alphabetical List)

Mary Jane Anderson
(Member At-Large)

Raymond Arveson
(Superintendent of
Minneapolis Public Schools)

Peter Bell
(Black Caucus -- Alternate)

Clyde Bellecourt
(Indian Caucus)

Irene Bethke
(Chicano/Latino Caucus)

Pam Berkwitz
(Member At-Large)

Joe Bigbear
(Indian Caucus -- Alternate)

Jeanette Cotton
(Community-Wide Service
Agencies Caucus)

Terri Couch
(Community-Wide Service
Agencies Caucus -- Alternate)

W. Harry Davis
(Member At-Large)

Louis DeMars
(President, Minneapolis
City Council)

Ron Edwards
(Black Caucus)

Rafael Esparza
(Chicano/Latino Caucus --
Alternate)

Frances Fairbanks
(Indian Caucus)

Douglas Fontaine
(Religious Caucus)

Dave Haskin
(Business Caucus)

Anne Heegaard
(Member At-Large)

Maynard Hinman
Indian Caucus)

Albert Hofstede
(Mayor, City of Minneapolis)

Nel Hollie
(Black Caucus)

Thomas Holloran
(Business Caucus)

Stan Kano
(Member At-Large)

Seymour Mansfield
(Member At-Large)

Janet Mathison
(Religious Caucus -- Alternate)

Kristen McGrath
(Community-Wide Service
Agencies Caucus)

Alvin Moline
(Labor Caucus)

David Nasby
(Neighborhood Service
Agencies Caucus)

Nancy Olkon
(Chairperson, Hennepin County
Board of Commissioners)

Jack Pearson
(Chairman of the Board)

Felino de la Pena
(Chicano/Latino Caucus)

Lawrence Perlman (Member At-Large)	Austin Sullivan (Business Caucus)
August Rivera (Member At-Large)	Frances Zamora (Chicano/Latino Caucus)
Paul Sand (Religious Caucus)	Vusumuzi Zulu (Black Caucus)

URBAN COALITION OF MINNEAPOLIS
STAFF
1978-1979

Earl D. Craig, Jr.	President
Peter J. McLaughlin	Research Director
Earl F. Rogers	Director of Community Outreach
Eugene D. Buckanaga	Assistant Director of Community Outreach
Arturo Perez	Assistant Director of Community Outreach
Michael R. Cohen	Education Project Director
Arvella Edwards	Education Project Assistant
Eunice Eckerly	Secretary
Cathy Allen	Secretary
Dorothy Doyle	Volunteer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Urban Coalition of Minneapolis wishes to acknowledge and thank the following institutions for their support of the Education Project:

Bemis Company Foundation

Carolyn Foundation

Center for Urban & Regional
Affairs of the University of Minnesota

Honeywell Fund

Minneapolis Foundation

Minneapolis Equal Opportunities Fund

Piper, Jaffray & Hopwood Fund